

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the present Application, with claims 4-9 being withdrawn. Claims 3 and 5 have been canceled, claims 1, 4, 8, 10, and 13 have been amended, and no claims have been added, leaving Claims 1-3 and 10-24 for consideration upon entry of the present Amendment.

Claims 1, 4, and 8 have been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 3 and 5, respectively, to correct certain formalities, and to clarify that the diisocyanate is branched or straight chain. Support for this amendment can be found at least in claims 3 and 5 as originally filed, and in the specification as originally filed in the paragraph bridging pages 6-7.

Claims 10 and 13 have been amended to clarify that the aminoplast-ether copolymer is present as a thickener. Support for this amendment can at least be found at page 6, line 11 in the specification as originally filed. The claims have further been amended correct the antecedent basis, i.e., to use the term "copolymer" rather than "polymer."

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Rejections of Claims 10-28

Claims 10-11 and 13-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly anticipated by Lau W., et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,376,709). Claims 10-24 further stand rejected as allegedly anticipated by Eisenhart et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,137,571). Finally, Claims 10-24 stand rejected as obvious over Eisenhart in view of Ma, et al., (ACS Symposium Series, 765, 2000, 254-270).

As basis for the rejections, the Examiner cites the disclosure of the various references directed to use of a cyclodextrin and a hydrophobically modified polyurethane thickener. However, independent claims 10 and 13 are directed to a composition containing a hydrophobically modified aminoplast-ether copolymer as a thickener. No references to

an aminoplast-ether thickener can be found in any of Lau or Eisenhart. It is therefore believed that claims 10 and 13 are novel over Lau and Eisenhart, as well as the claims that depend therefrom (claims 11-12 and 14-24).

Rejections of claims 1-3

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly anticipated by Ma, claims 1-2 stand rejected as allegedly anticipated by Lau, and claims 1-2 stand rejected as allegedly anticipated by Eisenhart. Finally, claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly obvious over Eisenhart in view of Ma. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 1 has been amended to more concisely claim the inventive features of the present composition. In particular, claim 1 (and corresponding withdrawn claims 4 and 8) have been amended to incorporate the diisocyanate functional group limitations of claim 3 and 5 respectively, and these claims have been cancelled. In addition, claims 1, 4, and 8 have been amended to recite "branched chain or straight chain" diisocyanate functional groups.

Ma discloses complexation of beta-cyclodextrin with various hydrophobically modified polyethoxylated urethanes wherein the diisocyanate group is based on a cyclic moiety (4,4'-methylene bis(cyclohexane); R'' in the structure shown on p. 261, or tetramethylene xylene (TMXDI), p. 261). Ma thus does not disclose or suggest urethanes wherein the diisocyanate group is based on a branched chained or a straight chained moiety as presently claimed. Claims 1-2 are accordingly not anticipated by Ma.

Lau discloses complexation of methyl-beta-cyclodextrin with thickeners. The only specific thickener disclosed is ACRY SOL® RM-8, "a hydrophobically modified polyurethane thickener." (Col. 4, lines 64-65.) This thickener, like the thickener in Ma, is based on a cyclic moiety (4,4'-methylene bis(cyclohexane)).

Lau does not disclose or suggest a thickener that contains a diisocyanate functional group of a size and configuration such that said diisocyanate functional group is capable of complexing with said hydrophobic cavity of said cyclodextrin-containing compound.

Further, there is no disclosure of a thickener that contains branched chain or straight chain diisocyanate functional groups. Lau thus does not anticipate claims 1-2 of the present application.

Eisenhart discloses complexation of cyclodextrin-containing compounds with thickeners such as hydrophobically modified polyethoxylated urethanes (e.g., claim 1). In Example 1, beta-cyclodextrin is complexed with the urethane thickener QR-708 from Rohm and Haas Company. QR-708, like the thickener in Ma, is based on a cyclic moiety (4,4'-methylene bis(cyclohexane)). The Examiner further noted Table 18 of Eisenhart, which uses the thickener ACRY SOLTM RM-5. This thickener is not a hydrophobically modified urethane thickener; rather it is based upon acrylic monomers, and is commonly known as a hydrophobically modified alkali soluble emulsion type thickener.

Eisenhart does not disclose or suggest a thickener that contains a diisocyanate functional group of a size and configuration such that said diisocyanate functional group is capable of complexing with said hydrophobic cavity of said cyclodextrin-containing compound. Further, there is no disclosure of a thickener that contains branched chain or straight chain diisocyanate functional groups. Eisenhart thus does not anticipate claims 1-2 of the present application.

Further, none of Ma, Lau, or Eisenhart renders claims 1-2 obvious, alone or in combination. None of these references teaches or suggests use of a thickener that contains branched chain or straight chain diisocyanate functional groups, or that such groups provide enhanced viscosity suppression relative to cyclic groups. The Examples of the application provide comparisons between hydrophobically modified polyethoxylated urethanes containing a cyclic diisocyanate functional group (4,4'-methylene bis-isocyanatocyclohexane, Des W) and an acyclic functional group (1,6-hexamethylene diisocyanate, HDI). In each set of examples (Tables 1-4), use of the HDI-based urethane provided better viscosity suppression than the DesW-based polyurethane.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-2 is therefore respectfully requested.

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicants. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection(s) and rejection(s) and allowance of the case are respectfully requested.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 18-1850.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By____/Leah M. Reimer/____
Leah M. Reimer
Reg. No. 39,341

Date: 12 April 2007
Customer No.: 21898
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115